

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

---

Sheree Renee Breedlove,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 20-cv-916 (DWF/TNL)

v.

Consolidated Vision Group, d/b/a  
America's Best Contacts & Eyeglasses, et  
al.,

**ORDER**

Defendants.

---

Plaintiff Sheree Renee Breedlove has filed a lawsuit alleging that she was discriminated against on the basis of race, age, and disability while an employee at America's Best Contacts and Eyeglasses. (ECF No. 1-1). Defendants answered the complaint on April 17, 2020.

Breedlove has now filed two motions. In the first, titled "Motion for an Insufficient or an Inadequate Response to My Complaint," Breedlove asks the Court to order Defendants to "explain my complaint." (ECF No. 14). She further asks the Court to inform what the "time limit" will be to respond to certain pages of an unidentified document. (*Id.*). She also notes that a statement made regarding a \$75,000 demand did not originate from her. (*Id.*). In an attached affidavit, Breedlove appears to dispute many of the statements that Defendants made in their answer. (ECF No. 15, pp. 3-5). She also identifies additional allegations that she wishes to include in her complaint. (ECF No. 15, p. 6).

The Court will deny this motion. Breedlove has not identified any legal authority with which to support this motion and it is not the Court's responsibility to sift her through motion papers and provide such authority for her. Further, it appears that Breedlove filed this motion because she disagreed with many of the assertions that Defendants made in their answer. Breedlove is not required to accept the assertions of Defendants as true, but she must now investigate and develop the facts of her case through the discovery process. Finally, to the extent that Breedlove wishes to amend her pleadings to include any additional allegations, she must file a motion in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15 and Local Rule 15.1. The Court will not address Breedlove's assertions regarding her responses to certain allegations or the alleged demand of \$75,000, as the Court cannot ascertain from Breedlove's motion what relief she is seeking or to what documents she is referring.

Breedlove has also filed a motion for a continuance. The Court will deny this motion without prejudice. Breedlove has not identified what the continuance relates to, or what dates in the pretrial scheduling order she wants modified. She must do so before the Court may assess whether a continuance is warranted.

Finally, though the Court has considered both motions on their respective merits, the Court notes that Breedlove did not file a meet-and-confer statement, as required by Local Rule 7.1(a). The Court cautions Breedlove that if she fails to comply with this requirement going forward, the Court will deny her future motions summarily. The Court recognizes that Breedlove is proceeding pro se in this matter. But she must still comply with all applicable rules, laws, and the like in this case. The Court will direct the Clerk of

Court to provide Breedlove with a copy of the Court's Pro Se Civil Guidebook, a resource for litigants like Breedlove who are representing themselves.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, and all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. The Motion for an Insufficient or an Inadequate Response to My Complaint (ECF No. 35) is **DENIED**.
2. The Motion for a Continuance (ECF No. 16) is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.
3. The Clerk of Court shall provide Breedlove with a copy of the Court's Pro Se Civil Guidebook.

Date: August 11, 2020

s/ Tony N. Leung  
Tony N. Leung  
United States Magistrate Judge  
District of Minnesota

*Breedlove v. Consolidated Vision Group,  
Inc., et al.*  
Case No. 20-cv-916 (DWF/TNL)